

Notice of Allowability

Application No.

09/607,592

Applicant(s)

PANG, DAYMAN

Examiner

Blaine Basom

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to Applicant's amendments, received 10/13/2005.
2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are 22-41.
3. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of the:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* Certified copies not received: _____.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.
THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.

4. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
5. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
(a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date _____.
(b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date _____.
Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).
6. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413),
Paper No./Mail Date _____ |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08),
Paper No./Mail Date _____ | 7. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Amendment/Comment |
| 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit
of Biological Material | 8. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance |
| | 9. <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 22-41 are allowed. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Regarding claim 22, it is well known within the art to create a device management application to manage a remote device by using code originally intended for execution on the remote device. For example, Dara-Abrams (U.S. Patent No. 6,456,892 to Dara-Abrams et al.) describes a graphical user interface (i.e. a "command-set unaware GUI" like claimed) used to manage a remote device, whereby the graphical user interface is linked with the code of the remote device (i.e. a "command-set aware user interface" like claimed) in order to issue commands to be executed on the remote device. That is, the prior art teaches: developing source code for a command-set aware user interface, developing source code for a command-set unaware GUI to be executed remotely from the remote device; and linking the source code for the command-set aware user interface in the source code for the command-set unaware GUI, such that the command-set aware user interface runs beneath the command-set unaware GUI, as is expressed in claim 22. The prior art, however, does not teach or suggest creating a device management application for a remote device, the application comprising code originally intended for execution on the remote device, and a GUI linked to the code, such that both the code originally intended for execution on the remote device and the GUI execute remotely from the remote device. That is, the prior art does not teach or suggest building the command set unaware GUI, with the linked source code for the command-set aware user interface, to create a device management application having both the command-set unaware GUI and the command-set aware user interface executing remotely from the remote device, as is expressed in claim 22.

As claims 23-31 depend on claim 22, and include all of the limitations of claim 22, each of claims 23-31 is considered allowable for the reasons in which claim 22 is allowed.

Regarding claim 32, it is well known within the art to create a device management application to remotely manage a network device by using code originally intended for execution on the network device. For example, Dara-Abrams (U.S. Patent No. 6,456,892 to Dara-Abrams et al.) describes a graphical user interface (GUI) used to manage a remote device, whereby the graphical user interface is linked with the code of the remote device (i.e. a “console user interface” like claimed) in order to issue commands to be executed on the remote device. That is, the prior art teaches: receiving source code defining a console user interface (CUI) to generate a CUI at a network device; receiving source code defining a GUI to generate a device management application, the GUI to be executed remotely from the network device, and whereby the source code for the GUI has a hook to the source code of the CUI; and building the source code for the GUI with the hook for the CUI to create a device management application having the CUI running under the GUI, as is expressed in claim 32. The prior art, however, does not teach or suggest creating a device management application for a remote device, the application comprising code originally intended for execution on the remote device, and a GUI linked to the code, such that both the code originally intended for execution on the remote device and the GUI execute remotely from the remote device. That is, the prior art does not teach or suggest building the GUI, with the hook to source code for the CUI, to create a device management application having both the GUI and the CUI executing remotely from the remote device, as is expressed in claim 32.

As claims 33-36 depend on claim 32, and include all of the limitations of claim 32, each of claims 33-36 is considered allowable for the reasons in which claim 32 is allowed.

Regarding claim 37, it is well known within the art to create a device management application to remotely manage a network device by using code originally intended for execution on the network device. For example, Dara-Abrams (U.S. Patent No. 6,456,892 to Dara-Abrams et al.) describes a graphical user interface (GUI) used to manage a remote device, whereby the graphical user interface is linked with the code of the remote device (i.e. a “console user interface” like claimed) in order to issue commands to be executed on the remote device. That is, the prior art teaches: a GUI and code libraries associated with a CUI, whereby the code libraries are linked with the GUI to create a GUI with a CUI running under the GUI, as is expressed in claim 37. The prior art, however, does not teach or suggest creating a device management application for a remote device, the application comprising code originally intended for execution on the remote device, and a GUI linked to the code, such that both the code originally intended for execution on the remote device and the GUI execute remotely from the remote device. That is, the prior art does not teach or suggest compiling the GUI, with linked code libraries of the CUI, to create a device management application having both the GUI and the CUI executing remotely from the remote device, as is expressed in claim 37.

As claims 38-41 depend on claim 37, and include all of the limitations of claim 37, each of claims 38-41 is considered allowable for the reasons in which claim 37 is allowed.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue

Art Unit: 2173


fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Blaine Basom whose telephone number is (571) 272-4044. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, from 8:30 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (571) 272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

btb
12/12/2005


TADESSE HAILU
12/12/05